UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/896,140	06/29/2001	Shari Gharavy	85160.923	5419

33438	7590	08/20/2004

HAMILTON & TERRILE, LLP
P.O. BOX 203518
AUSTIN, TX 78720

EXAMINER
SCHLAIFER, JONATHAN D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 08/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/896,140	GHARAVY, SHARI
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jonathan D. Schlaifer	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>6/29/01</u>.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
   closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>29 June 2001</u> is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

   1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
      application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/23/01, 7/5/02</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to application 09/896,140 filed on 6/29/2001, with prior art filed

    on 8/23/2001 and 7/5/2002.

2. Claims 1-28 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 8, 15, and 22 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. **Claims 1-are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hyman et al.**

    (USPN 6,772,395 B1—filing date 2/1/2000), hereinafter Hyman.

4. **Regarding independent claim 1,** Hyman discloses an extensible method for simplifying

    input provided to a computer program (Hyman discloses a data flow architecture that can

    modify and simplify data in the Abstract, lines 1-15) comprising: creating a framework

    for a first grammar level (in col. 4, lines 5-15, the use of schemas as frameworks in

    conjunction with the invention is disclosed); performing a first transformation of said

    framework to generate a first set of rules relating to interpretation of said first grammar

    level (transformation in conjunction with the schemas is inherently involved with the

    transformation described in col. 3, lines 20-35); performing a second transformation of

    said framework to generate a first presentation style for said first grammar level

    (transformation in conjunction with an XSL presentation style is described in col. 3, lines

    20-35); obtaining a user defined input in said first grammar, said user defined input

    conforming to said first set of rules (Hyman describes a message bus in col. 3, lines 35-

    50, which obtains rule-based user input); applying said first set of rules and said first

    presentation style to said user defined input to generate an output in a second grammar

understood by an application's parser (applying the rules and the presentation style occurs in the transformation described by col. 3, lines 20-35).

5. **Regarding dependent claim 2,** Hyman describes a method wherein creating a framework comprises: creating one or more files having grammar definitions conforming to a second set of rules (this limitation corresponds with the XML schemas of col. 4, lines 5-15); and transforming said one or more files into said framework using a second presentation style conforming to said framework (using the XML schemas is described in conjunction with XSL transformation in col. 4, lines 5-15 and col. 3, lines 20-35.

6. **Regarding dependent claim 3,** Hyman discloses in element 410 of Figure 4B a first transformation with an independent transformation style. Given the prior independent styles, this would be a third style.

7. **Regarding dependent claim 4,** Hyman discloses in element 420 of Figure 4B a second transformation with an independent transformation style. Given the prior independent styles, this would be a fourth style.

8. **Regarding dependent claim 5,** Hyman uses XML for the first grammar of said user defined input (col. 11, lines 5-15), and XML is extensible.

9. **Regarding dependent claim 6,** Hyman discloses that the second grammar understood by said application's parser is that of XML and XSL, which is inherently fixed.

10. **Regarding dependent claim 7,** Hyman discloses in col. 3, lines 20-35 that the data representation language is extensible markup language (XML).

11. **Regarding independent claim 8,** it is a computer readable medium that is functionally similar to the method of claim 1, and is rejected under similar rationale.

12. **Regarding dependent claim 9,** it is a computer readable medium that is functionally similar to the method of claim 2, and is rejected under similar rationale.

13. **Regarding dependent claim 10,** it is a computer readable medium that is functionally similar to the method of claim 3, and is rejected under similar rationale.

14. **Regarding dependent claim 11,** it is a computer readable medium that is functionally similar to the method of claim 4, and is rejected under similar rationale.

15. **Regarding dependent claim 12,** it is a computer readable medium that is functionally similar to the method of claim 5, and is rejected under similar rationale.

16. **Regarding dependent claim 13,** it is a computer readable medium that is functionally similar to the method of claim 6, and is rejected under similar rationale.

17. **Regarding dependent claim 14,** it is a computer readable medium that is functionally similar to the method of claim 7, and is rejected under similar rationale.

18. **Regarding independent claim 15,** it is a computer readable medium that is functionally similar to the method of claim 1, and is rejected under similar rationale.

19. **Regarding dependent claim 16,** it is a computer readable medium that is functionally similar to the method of claim 2, and is rejected under similar rationale.

20. **Regarding dependent claim 17,** it is a computer readable medium that is functionally similar to the method of claim 3, and is rejected under similar rationale.

21. **Regarding dependent claim 18,** it is a computer readable medium that is functionally similar to the method of claim 4, and is rejected under similar rationale.

22. **Regarding dependent claim 19,** it is a computer readable medium that is functionally similar to the method of claim 5, and is rejected under similar rationale.

23. **Regarding dependent claim 20,** it is a computer readable medium that is functionally similar to the method of claim 6, and is rejected under similar rationale.

24. **Regarding dependent claim 21,** it is a computer readable medium that is functionally similar to the method of claim 7, and is rejected under similar rationale.

25. **Regarding independent claim 22,** it is a method that is functionally similar to the method of claim 1 and is rejected under similar rationale.

26. **Regarding dependent claim 23,** it is a method that is functionally similar to the method of claim 2 and is rejected under similar rationale.

27. **Regarding dependent claim 24,** it is a method that is functionally similar to the method of claim 3 and is rejected under similar rationale.

28. **Regarding dependent claim 25,** it is a method that is functionally similar to the method of claim 4 and is rejected under similar rationale.

29. **Regarding dependent claim 26,** it is a method that is functionally similar to the method of claim 5 and is rejected under similar rationale.

30. **Regarding dependent claim 27,** it is a method that is functionally similar to the method of claim 6 and is rejected under similar rationale.

31. **Regarding dependent claim 28,** it is a method that is functionally similar to the method of claim 7 and is rejected under similar rationale.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

USPN 6,643,708 B1 (filing date 10/29/1998)— Francis et al.

USPN 6,535,896 B2 (filing date 1/29/1999)— Britton et al.

USPN 6,356,920 B1 (filing date 3/8/1999)— Vandersluis

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jonathan D. Schlaifer whose telephone number is 703-305-9777. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 703-308-5465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JS

STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER